

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action mailed May 13, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1 to 20. These rejections are respectfully traversed. This Amendment "A" cancels no claims, amends claims 1, 12, 15, 18, and 20 and adds no new claims. Accordingly, claims 1 to 20 remain pending in this application.

The Examiner has required a new oath or declaration. Enclosed herewith is a Supplemental Declaration.

The Examiner indicated that the first sentence of the specification must be updated. The specification has been amended.

Claims 1 to 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rixon et al. (US 5,890,399) in view of Kelley et al. (5,613,405).

Rixon et al. discloses an adjustable pedal assembly having a Bowden cable (42) with casing (42a). Ends of the cable core are secured to worm gears 46, 63. Rixon et al. is silent as to how the ends of the casing (42a) are secured. In Figures 1 and 7, the casing (42a) appears to be provided with common prior art fittings where the ends of the casing snugly engage the separate fittings which are firmly attached to the structure to prevent longitudinal movement of the casing once the fittings are installed. Kelly et al. also discloses a cable assembly having a core (14) and a conduit or casing (12). Kelly et al. is also silent as to how the ends of the casing (12) are secured. In Figure 1, the casing (12) appears to be provided with the common prior art grommets where the ends of the casing snugly engage the separate grommets which are firmly attached to the vehicle structure to prevent longitudinal movement of the casing once the grommets are installed. The Examiner cited the protrusions or fingers (48) which snap into the aperture (22) of the pedal (16). Note that these fingers (48) are part of a coupling means (20) which secure the core (14) to the pedal (16). These fingers (48) or the coupling means (20) play no role in securing the casing (12) to the structure. It is important to note that the present invention relates to an improved connection for the casing of the cable assembly rather than the core of the cable assembly. The casing according to the present invention has a preformed

unitary connector. Neither Rixen et al. or Kelly et al. disclose or reasonably suggest such a casing connector.

No prior art of record reasonably discloses or suggests the present invention as defined by independent claim 1. Independent claim 1, and claims dependent therefrom, each require “an elongate flexible casing encircling a longitudinal length of the core and having a preformed unitary connector at one end” and “wherein the unitary connector of the casing cooperates with the end fitting to secure the casing to the end fitting and hold the casing stationary relative to the end fitting”. As discussed above, Rixen et al. and Kelly et al. are each silent as to how the casing is secured. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

No prior art of record reasonably discloses or suggests the present invention as defined by independent claim 12. Independent claim 12, and claims dependent therefrom, each require “an elongate flexible casing encircling a longitudinal length of the core and having a preformed, unitary connector with at least one deflectable protrusion” and “wherein the connector of the casing and the end fitting form a snap-fit connection to secure the casing to the end fitting and hold the casing stationary relative to the end fitting and the deflectable protrusion of the connector engages the end fitting with an interference fit such that the deflectable protrusion is in an unrelaxed state to reduce vibration between the casing and the end fitting.” As discussed above, Rixen et al. and Kelly et al. are each silent as to how the casing is secured. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

No prior art of record reasonably discloses or suggests the present invention as defined by independent claim 15. Independent claim 15, and claims dependent therefrom, each require “wherein the casing has a preformed enlarged cylindrically-shaped end portion forming an end surface of the casing and having an inner diameter closely receiving the elongated portion of the end fitting” and “wherein the casing has at least one protrusion extending from the inner surface of the casing and into the groove of the elongated portion to interlock the casing with the end fitting and to hold the casing stationary relative to the end fitting”. As discussed above, Rixen et al. and Kelly et al. are each silent as to how the casing is secured. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.


No prior art of record reasonably discloses or suggests the present invention as defined by independent claim 18. Independent claim 18, and claims dependent therefrom, each require “an elongate flexible casing encircling a longitudinal length of the core and having a connector”, “wherein the connector comprises a preformed, unitary enlarged end portion having a generally cylindrically shaped outer surface and a flange extending generally perpendicular to the outer surface of the elongated portion” and “wherein the outer surface of the connector extends through the aperture of the end fitting and the flange of the connector engages the end fitting adjacent the aperture of the end fitting to secure the casing to the end fitting and to hold the casing stationary relative to the end fitting”. As discussed above, Rixen et al. and Kelly et al. are each silent as to how the casing is secured. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is found that the present amendment does not place the application in a condition for allowance, applicant's undersigned attorney requests that the examiner initiate a telephone interview to expedite prosecution of the application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-2326.

Respectfully submitted,  
PORTER, WRIGHT, MORRIS & ARTHUR LLP

October 1, 2004



Richard M. Mescher, Reg. No. 38,242

Porter, Wright, Morris & Arthur  
41 South High Street  
Columbus, OH 43215-6194